arXiv:1611.03362v1 [math.DG] 10 Nov 2016

MINIMIZING CONES ASSOCIATED WITH ISOPARAMETRIC FOLIATIONS

ZIZHOU TANG AND YONGSHENG ZHANG

ABSTRACT. This paper is concerned with cones associated with isoparametric foliations in unit spheres. In particular, infinitely many new minimizing cones were constructed. They are cones over focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations. A major portion of them are inhomogeneous. Further, we show that suitable products of multiple focal submanifolds can generate minimizing cones as well.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces and induced hypercones 3
3. Minimizing cones over focal submanifolds 6
3.1. Lawlor's curvature criterion 6
3.2. Case for $g = 4$ 9
3.3. Cases for $g = 3$ and 6 10
4. Cones over products of focal submanifolds in spheres 11
4.1. For normal radius 12
4.2. Existence of vanishing angles 15
4.3. Comparison between ϕ and $2\theta_0$ 16
4.4. Extension to the multiple case 18
4.5. To include $g = 2$. 19
Appendix 20
References 21

1. INTRODUCTION

Minimizing hypercones have fascinating originations and active developments in geometric measure theory, for example, the pioneering works Fleming [Fle62], De Giorgi [DG65], Almgren [Alm66], Simons [Sim68], Bombieri-De Giorgi-Giusti [BDGG69] for solving the celebrated Bernstein problem.

Date: November 11, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C40, 53C38, 49Q15.

Key words and phrases. minimizing cone, isoparametric foliation, focal submanifold, minimal product, Lawlor's curvature criterion.

Many types of minimizing hypercones beyond Simons cones were discovered by Lawson in [Law72]. Later [Sim74, Sim73] added that $C_{2,4}$ over minimal Clifford torus $S^2(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}) \times S^4(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}) \subset S^7(1)$ is minimizing (also see [Zha16]) whereas $C_{1,5}$ is only stably minimal. Although lots of examples had been found, a complete list of homogeneous minimizing hypercones remained unknown until the important work of Lawlor [Law91]. Rather than in the whole Euclidean space, Lawlor searched for a similar bundle structure to the characterization foliation of a minimizing hypercone given by Hardt and Simon in [HS85] in certain angular neighborhood of the cone under consideration.

More flexible than homogeneous foliations are the isoparametric ones. In 1985, Ferus and Karcher [FK85] were able to construct the characterization foliation by homothetic minimizing hypersurfaces following an ODE way for "almost all" minimal isoparametric hypercones of OT-FKM type, and hence showed each of them minimizing.

Thereafter, to figure out a complete classification of minimizing isoparametric hypercones became important in the subject. Based on the method of [FK85], an explicit list was given in [Wan94]. Unfortunately, the arguments for strict minimality in his §9 were invalid due to the incorrect Remark 9.17 on the correct formula in [HS85]. We shall give an alternative proof in §2.

Since a tangent cone (at some point) of an area-minimizing rectifiable current is itself area-minimizing (Theorem 5.4.3 in [Fed69], also see Theorem 35.1 and Remark 34.6 (2) in [Sim83]), the study of minimizing cones of higher codimensions is of equal importance. Besides minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces, another class of minimal submanifolds associated with isoparametric foliations are focal submanifolds. By the efforts of [Law91, Ker94, HKT00, Kan02, OS], cones over focal submanifolds of homogeneous isoparametric foliations with $g = 3, 4, 6$ distinct principal curvatures and multiplicities $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ had been shown minimizing. However, it seems more natural to consider cones over general focal submanifolds simultaneously and we shall do so in §3. Quite interestingly, for some of isoparametric foliations, their minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces cannot generate minimizing cones, but the corresponding focal submanifolds can.

Taking advantage of focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations in spheres, we establish

Theorem 1. *Cones over focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations in unit spheres with $g = 4$ and $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ are area-minimizing.*

Remark 1.1. *Lots of them are inhomogeneous v.s. those equivariant minimizing cones constructed in* [XYZ]. *It should be remarked that for some inhomogeneous isoparametric foliations their focal submanifolds can possibly be homogeneous. For details readers are referred to* [FKM81].

Remark 1.2. *For $g = 4, m_1 = m_2 = 2$, both $C(M_+)$ and $C(M_-)$, the cones over the focal submanifolds M_+ and M_-, are minimizing and of dimension 7 in $\mathbb{R}^{10}$. Moreover, since the vanishing angle is less than $\frac{\pi}{8} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\pi}{4}$, their union $C(M_+ \bigsqcup M_-)$ is minimizing as well.*

Remark 1.3. *When M_t for $t = +$ or $-$ is nonorientable, $C(M_t)$ is minimizing in the sense of mod* 2 *(see* [Zie62]*). For $g = 4$ and $(m_1, m_2) = (1, k)$, M_+ is diffeomorphic to $V_2(\mathbb{R}^{k+2})$ and M_- is isometric to $S^1 \times S^{k+1}/\mathbb{Z}_2$ (see* [TY13]*). It can be proved without difficulty that the latter is orientable if and only if k is even.*

Our investigation can also work for $g = 3,\ 6$, and leads to
Theorem 2. *Cones over focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations with $g = 3, 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ are area-minimizing.*

Question. It will be interesting to ask whether cones over focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations with $g = 3, 4, 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$ are minimizing. To resovle the question, it seems necessary to introduce new ideas and tools.

For cones over products of focal submanifolds in spheres, the following can be proved
Theorem 3. *Cones over the minimal products of two focal submanifolds (of isoparametric foliations) with $g = 3, 4, 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ are area-minimizing.*

To include cases of $g = 3, 4, 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$, we have
Theorem 4. *Cones, of dimension no less than* 10*, over the minimal products of two focal submanifolds corresponding to $g = 3, 4, 6$ are area-minimizing.*

Remark 1.4. *By a revisit to proofs of both theorems in §4.4, we generalize Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 with the same conclusions for cones over the minimal products of multiple focal submanifolds . Further, we remove the restriction on g for the generalized Theorem 4 in §4.5.*

Remark 1.5. *In fact one can also investigate cones over products of multiple minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces, and products among focal submanifolds and minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces.*

The paper is organized as follows. In §2 we review the classification of isoparametric foliations, Ferus and Karcher's result on isoparametric minimizing hypercones and Lawlor's classification of homogeneous minimizing hypercones. As a result, classification of isoparametric minimizing hypercones and the property that isoparametric minimizing hypecones are all strictly area-minimizing easily follow. In §3.1 we briefly go through the ideas of Lawlor's curvature criterion, then apply it to cones over focal submanifolds in §3.2 and §3.3 for $g = 4$, and $g = 3,\ 6$ respectively. In §4, we first consider cones over products of two focal submanfolds, next establish Theorem 3 and Theorem 4, then extend both to the case of products of several focal submanifolds in §4.4, and finally include the case involving $g = 2$ in §4.5.

2. Minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces and induced hypercones

A closed (embedded) hypersurface M in the unit sphere $S^{n-1}(1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called isoparametric, by E. Cartan, if it has constant principal curvatures. Moreover, if M is

isoparametric, then so are its parallel hypersurfaces. In this way, a foliation of hypersurfaces appears with two exceptional leaves – focal submanifolds of higher codimensions. As it is well known, there is one and only one minimal hypersurface among the parallel isoparametric hypersurfaces in an isoparametric foliation.

Let ξ be a unit normal vector field along M, g the number of distinct principal curvatures of M, $\cot\theta_\alpha$ ($\alpha = 1, \cdots, g; 0 < \theta_1 < \cdots < \theta_g < \pi$) the principal curvatures with respect to ξ and m_α the multiplicity of $\cot\theta_\alpha$. By a purely topological method, Münzner proved an elegant result that g must be $1, 2, 3, 4$ or 6 and $m_\alpha = m_{\alpha+2}$ (indices mod g). According to values of g, we have the following.

$g = 1$. The foliation is a trivial one, namely it is given by level sets of a height function restricted to $S^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to a direction.

$g = 2$. Regular leaves of the foliation are of $S^p \times S^{n-2-p}$ type and the corresponding focal submanifolds are great spheres S^p and S^{n-2-p}.

$g = 3$. $m_1 = m_2 = m_3$ has to take values among $1, 2, 4$ and 8. Cartan showed that the foliations are homogeneous (see, for example, [CR85]). Moreover, all isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres with 3 principal curvatures are precisely the tubes of constant radius over the standard Veronese embedding of $\mathbb{F}P^2$ for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{H}$ (quaternions), $\mathbb{O}$ (Cayley numbers) in S^4, S^7, S^{13}, S^{25}, respectively.

$g = 6$. $m_1 = m_2 = m$ by Münzner [Mün80] and m has to be 1 or 2 by Abresch [Abr83]. For $m = 1$, Dorfmeister and Neher [DN85] proved that the foliation is homogeneous. Very recently, Miyaoka [Miy13, Miy16] was able to gain the same conclusion for $m = 2$.

$g = 4$. By the recent beautiful results of Cecil-Chi-Jensen [CCJ07] and Chi [Chi], the classification gets complete. Such a foliation must be either of OT-FKM type or homogeneous with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$ or $(4, 5)$. Here the OT-FKM type means that leaves of the foliation are given by

$$M_t = \mathbf{F}^{-1}(t) \bigcap S^{n-1}(1) \quad \text{for } t \in [-1, +1]$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}(x) = < x, x >^2 - 2 \sum_{i=0}^{m} < P_i x, x >^2, \quad m \geq 1$$

for self-adjoint endomorphisims $P_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$, for $i = 0, \cdots, m$, with relation $P_i P_j + P_j P_i = 2\delta_{ij}\mathrm{Id}$. Such structure exists only when $n = 2l$ and $l = k\delta(m)$ (see [FKM81]). Its multiplicities satisfy $(m_1, m_2) = (m, l - m - 1)$.

Among foliations of OT-FKM, the first inhomogeneous foliation occurs when $m_1 + m_2 = 7$ for $(3, 4)$. All other inhomogeneous foliations appear when $3 \leq m_1 < m_2$ and $m_1 + m_2 \geq 11$. Theorem 2 of [FK85] states that each inhomogeneous minimal isoparametric hypersurface M^* of OT-FKM type leads to a minimizing hypercone

$$C(M^*) = \{tx : x \in M^* \text{ and } t \in [0, \infty)\}.$$

In fact their argument works for all minimal isoparametric hypersurface of OT-FKM type with $m_1 + m_2 \geq 11$.

Combining the classification theorem of isoparametric foliations mentioned above, Theorem 2 of [FK85] and Lawlor's classification table on homogeneous minimizing hypercones verifies the classification given by [Wan94].

Submanifold of sphere	Cone is area-minimizing	Cone is stable but not minimizing	Cone is Unstable
$\mathbf{S}^{r-1} \times \mathbf{S}^{s-1}$	$r = 3,\ s = 5$ $r = 4,\ s = 4$ $r + s > 8$	$r = 2,\ s = 6$	$r + s < 8$
$\frac{SO(2) \times SO(m)}{\mathbf{Z}_2 \times SO(m-2)}$	$m > 8$	$m = 8$	$3 \leq m \leq 7$
$\frac{SU(2) \times SU(m)}{T^1 \times SU(m-2)}$	$m \geq 4$		$m = 2, 3$
$\frac{Sp(2) \times Sp(m)}{Sp(1)^2 \times Sp(m-2)}$	$m \geq 2$		
$\frac{U(5)}{SU(2) \times SU(2) \times T^1}$	×		
$\frac{SO(3)}{\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2}$			×
$\frac{SU(3)}{T^2}$			×
$\frac{Sp(3)}{Sp(1)^3}$	×		
$\frac{Sp(2)}{T^2}$			×
$\frac{G_2}{T^2}$			×
$\frac{F_4}{Spin(8)}$	×		
$\frac{Spin(10) \times U(1)}{SU(4) \times T^1}$	×		
$\frac{SO(4)}{\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2}$			×

Lawlor's classification of homogeneous minimizing hypercones

Theorem. ([Wan94]) Let M^* be a minimal isoparametric hypersurface in S^{n-1}. Then $C(M^*)$ is minimizing if and only if $n \geq 4g$ and $(g, m_1, m_2) \neq (2, 1, 5)$ or $(4, 1, 6)$.

By §4.3 of [Law91], Lawlor's criterion about $C(M^*)$ is not only sufficient but also necessary for a minimal isoparametric hypersurface M^*. Moreover, whenever the criterion holds, the cone becomes strictly area-minimizing automatically. Hence the next statement follows.

Proposition. ([Wan94]) Let M^* be a minimal isoparametric hypersurface in S^{n-1}. If $C(M^*)$ is minimizing, it is actually strictly area-minimizing.

3. Minimizing cones over focal submanifolds

It is well known that focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations are minimal submanifolds in spheres. They generate minimal cones. Based on their special second fundamental forms, we apply Lawlor's criterion to show Theorem 1.

To be self-contained, we briefly review Lawlor's method in §3.1. Then §3.2 is devoted to a proof of Theorem 1. Along the same line, homogeneous cases for $g = 3$ and 6 will be discussed in §3.3.

3.1. **Lawlor's curvature criterion.** Let us recall some notations.

Definition 3.1. *Let B be a submanifold of dimension $k-1$ in S^{n-1} and $C = C(B)$. Fix $p \in B$. Let N^{n-k} be the $(n-k)$-dimensional great sphere which intersects B at p orthogonally. For $0 < \eta < \pi$, denote by $U_p(\eta)$ the open η-disk centered at p in N^{n-k}. Then $W_p(\eta) = C(U_p(\eta))$ is called the η-***normal wedge*** through p. Conventionally, we leave out the origin, so that one can talk about "nonintersecting normal wedges". We name $\bigcup_{p\in B} W_p(\eta)$ the η-***angle neighborhood*** of C. The* ***normal radius*** *of C at p means the largest angular radius η for $W_p(\eta)$ intersecting C only in the ray $\overrightarrow{0p}$.*



η-normal wedges of a cone

Since the unique minimizing foliation for an area-minimizing hypercone in [HS85] has the property of homothety, so do its perpendicular integral curves (outside the origin). The latter naturally induces an area-nonincreasing projection to the cone. Instead, Lawlor looked for similar structure in some η-angular neighborhood of a minimal cone

C rather than in $\mathbb{R}^n$. If the boundary of the neighborhood happens to be mapped to the origin under the projection, then one can send everything outside the neighborhood to the origin. In this way an area-nonincreasing projection can be produced.

Lawlor considered the structure given by rotation of a suitable curve γ_p in each normal wedge $W_p(\eta)$ for $p \in B$. Positive homotheties of the surface rotated by γ_p are required to foliate the normal wedge. Under the assumption that elements of $\{W_p(\eta) : p \in B\}$ do not intersect each other, the existence of his preferred area-nonincreasing projection in the η-angular neighborhood is equivalent to that the O.D. InE.:

$$\left(h(t) - \frac{t}{k}h'(t)\right)^2 + \left(\frac{h'(t)}{k}\right)^2 \le \left(\det(I - th^\nu_{ij})\right)^2, \qquad h(0) = 1,$$

where $t = \tan(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [0, \eta)$ and h^ν_{ij} means the second fundamental form for a unit normal ν to C at p, has a solution which can reach zero for each ν. Letting ν range over all unit normals at p, the requirement becomes that

$$\left(h(t) - \frac{t}{k}h'(t)\right)^2 + \left(\frac{h'(t)}{k}\right)^2 \le \left(q(t)\right)^2, \qquad h(0) = 1, \tag{3.1}$$

where $q(t) = \inf_\nu \det(I - th^\nu_{ij}) = 1 + q_2t^2 + \cdots$ supports a solution which reaches zero.

In fact it can be shown that the solution $h_0(t)$ which attains zero fastest, if exists, must satisfy the equality in (3.1).

Definition 3.2. *Suppose $h_0(t)$ gets zero at $t = \tan(\theta_0(p))$. We call $\theta_0 = \max_{p\in B} \theta_0(p)$ the vanishing angle of C.*

θ_0 stands for the narrowest (uniform) size for the above construction for the preferred area-nonincreasing projection.

In summary, there are two things to check for applying Lawlor's criterion:

1. There exists a finite vanishing angle θ_0. Here we would like to remark that (3.1) may support no solutions which can touch zero; and
2. The θ_0-normal wedges do not intersect.

A technical point is how to control $q(t)$ in practice. Corollary 1.3.3 in [Law91] says that, for $\ell \ge 2$ and $t \in [0, \frac{1}{\alpha}\sqrt{\frac{\ell}{\ell-1}}]$,

$$\det(I - th^\nu_{ij}) \ge F(\alpha, t, \ell) \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$F(\alpha, t, \ell) = \left(1 - \alpha t\sqrt{\frac{\ell-1}{\ell}}\right)\left(1 + \frac{\alpha t}{\sqrt{\ell(\ell-1)}}\right)^{\ell-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = \sup_\nu \|h^\nu_{ij}\| = \sup_\nu \sqrt{\sum_{i,j}(h^\nu_{ij})^2}.$$

The inequality is sharp; for certain matrices, equality holds for all t. (For example, for the classical coassociative Lawson-Osserman cone in $\mathbb{R}^7$, see [XYZ].)

Note that $F(\alpha, t, \ell)$ is nonincreasing in ℓ. Limiting $\ell \to \infty$ leads to Corollary 1.3.4

$$\det(I - th^\nu_{ij}) \ge F(\alpha, t, \ell) > (1 - \alpha t)e^{\alpha t}. \tag{3.3}$$

Based on (3.2) and (3.3), Lawlor considered

$$\left(h(t)-\frac{t}{k}h'(t)\right)^2+\left(\frac{h'(t)}{k}\right)^2=\left(F(\alpha,t,\ell)\right)^2,\qquad h(0)=1, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\left(h(t)-\frac{t}{k}h'(t)\right)^2+\left(\frac{h'(t)}{k}\right)^2=\left((1-\alpha t)e^{\alpha t}\right)^2,\qquad h(0)=1, \tag{3.5}$$

respectively. Let $\theta_F(p)$ and $\theta_c(p)$ be the corresponding vanishing angles. Then

$$\theta_0(p)\le\theta_F(p)<\theta_c(p).$$

Lawlor gained the following table for $\dim(C)$ and α^2.

α^2	Dimension of C					
	3	4	5	6	7	8
0.00	39.81	27.46	20.10	17.02	14.32	12.34
0.05	40.60	27.61	21.07	17.05	14.32	12.36
0.10	41.56	27.78	21.14	17.08	14.35	12.37
0.15	42.80	27.97	21.19	17.12	14.37	12.38
0.20	44.57	28.16	21.26	17.14	14.39	12.40
0.25	(50)	28.36	21.33	17.18	14.41	12.40
0.30	---	28.58	21.40	17.20	14.42	12.42
0.35	---	28.83	21.48	17.24	14.43	12.43
0.40	---	29.07	21.55	17.28	14.45	12.44
0.45	---	29.33	21.62	17.31	14.47	12.45
0.50	---	29.63	21.70	17.34	14.49	12.45
0.55	---	29.94	21.78	17.38	14.51	12.47
0.60	---	30.29	21.88	17.42	14.53	12.48
0.65	---	30.66	21.97	17.45	14.54	12.49
0.70	---	31.09	22.06	17.49	14.56	12.51
0.75	---	31.57	22.15	17.53	14.59	12.51
0.80	---	32.15	22.24	17.57	14.60	12.53
0.85	---	32.85	22.35	17.61	14.62	12.53
0.90	---	33.74	22.44	17.65	14.65	12.55
0.95	---	35.05	22.55	17.69	14.68	12.57
1.00	---	(41)	22.66	17.74	14.69	12.57
1.10	---	---	22.89	17.81	14.74	12.60
1.20	---	---	23.15	17.90	14.78	12.62
1.30	---	---	23.43	17.10	14.82	12.65
1.40	---	---	23.73	18.09	14.87	12.68
1.50	---	---	24.08	18.20	14.91	12.71
1.60	---	---	24.47	18.31	14.96	12.73
1.70	---	---	24.93	18.41	15.01	12.75
1.80	---	---	25.45	18.52	15.07	12.78
1.90	---	---	26.10	18.66	15.12	12.82
2.00	---	---	26.97	18.77	15.17	12.84
2.20	---	---	30.73	19.06	15.29	12.90
2.40	---	---	---	19.36	15.40	12.96
2.60	---	---	---	19.71	15.52	13.03
2.80	---	---	---	20.13	15.66	13.10
3.00	---	---	---	20.61	15.81	13.17
3.25	---	---	---	21.40	15.99	13.25
3.50	---	---	---	22.56	16.20	13.36
3.75	---	---	---	24.84	16.44	13.45
4.00	---	---	---	(***)	16.71	13.55
4.50	---	---	---	---	17.37	13.79
5.00	---	---	---	---	18.30	14.07
5.50	---	---	---	---	19.99	14.37
6.00	---	---	---	---	***	14.75
6.50	---	---	---	---	---	15.23
7.00	---	---	---	---	---	15.84
7.50	---	---	---	---	---	16.77
8.00	---	---	---	---	---	18.73
8.50	---	---	---	---	---	***
9.00	---	---	---	---	---	***

α^2	Dimension of C			
	9	10	11	12
0.00	10.86	9.69	8.75	7.97
0.20	10.88	9.70	8.76	7.99
0.40	10.91	9.73	8.78	7.99
0.60	10.94	9.74	8.79	8.01
0.80	10.97	9.77	8.81	8.01
1.00	11.01	9.79	8.82	8.03
1.20	11.04	9.81	8.83	8.04
1.40	11.07	9.83	8.85	8.05
1.60	11.10	9.85	8.87	8.06
1.80	11.14	9.87	8.88	8.07
2.00	11.17	9.90	8.89	8.08
2.50	11.26	9.96	8.94	8.12
3.00	11.36	10.03	8.98	8.15
3.50	11.46	10.09	9.03	8.18
4.00	11.57	10.16	9.07	8.21
4.50	11.71	10.23	9.13	8.25
5.00	11.83	10.32	9.17	8.28
6.00	12.14	10.48	9.29	8.36
7.00	12.51	10.68	9.41	8.45
8.00	12.99	10.91	9.54	8.55
9.00	13.68	11.18	9.69	8.64
10.00	14.83	11.51	9.86	8.75
11.00	***	11.94	10.05	8.87
13.00	---	13.51	10.55	9.17
15.00	---	***	11.35	9.55
17.00	---	---	13.90	10.11
19.00	---	---	***	11.23
21.00	---	---	---	***
23.00	---	---	---	***
25.00	---	---	---	***

Table of upper bounds of vanishing angles

Here are some notes:

(3.6) The column for $\dim(C) = 12$ uses (3.5), while others rely on (3.4).

(3.7) *** indicate that a solution of the O.D.E exists in some interval $[0, \theta]$, but the vanishing angle based on the method does not exist in general.

(3.8) However, since the equality of (3.2) and (3.3) may not be attained, slots filled with "***" could still support actual vanishing angles.

(3.9) Values in parentheses are tentative, pending on more numerical analysis.

Generally, using (3.4) gives more accurate data. Nevertheless, (3.5) has a key advantage, Proposition 1.4.2 in [Law91]:

> Let k be the dimension of a minimal cone under consideration, α explained in (3.2), and $\theta_c(k, \alpha)$ the vanishing angle for (3.5) depending on k, α. Then for any $\ell > k$,

$$\tan(\theta_c(\ell, \frac{\ell}{k}\alpha)) < \frac{k}{\ell}\tan(\theta_c(k, \alpha)). \tag{3.10}$$

One can make use of this property to estimate vanishing angles for $\dim(C) > 12$.

Another useful property is the following monotonicity:

$$0 < \theta_c(k, \alpha) < \theta_c(k, \beta) \text{ for } 0 \le \alpha < \beta \tag{3.11}$$

which comes from the monotonicity of $(1-\alpha t)e^{\alpha t}$ in α. Similarly, one can define $\theta_F(k, \alpha)$ and have

$$0 < \theta_F(k, \alpha) < \theta_F(k, \beta) \text{ for } 0 \le \alpha < \beta. \tag{3.12}$$

Now we are ready to proceed.

3.2. **Case for $g = 4$.** Let M_+ and M_- be focal submanifolds of an isoparametric foliation of $g = 4$. Main points are:

1. $\frac{\pi}{4}$-normal wedges of $C(M_+)$ or $C(M_-)$ are nonintersecting.

2. In the isoparametric setting, θ_0 only depends on k, α and we can check everything merely at one point. If vanishing angle θ_0 exists and moreover is less than $\frac{\pi}{4}$, then $C(M_+)$ or $C(M_-)$ is minimizing.

3. Note that $\frac{\sqrt{x-2}}{x}$ is strictly decreasing when $x \ge 4$. So, for $\ell > k > 4$, we have

$$\frac{\sqrt{\ell-2}}{\ell} < \frac{\sqrt{k-2}}{k} \Rightarrow \sqrt{\ell-2} < \frac{\ell}{k}\sqrt{k-2}.$$

By (3.10), (3.11) and the table of upper bounds of vanishing angles, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\tan(\theta_c(\ell,\ \sqrt{\ell-2})) < \tan(\theta_c(\ell, \frac{\ell}{k}\sqrt{k-2})) < \frac{k}{\ell}\tan(\theta_c(k,\ \sqrt{k-2})) \\ &(\textit{when } \ell > k = 12) \qquad\qquad < \tan(\theta_c(12,\ \sqrt{10})) < \tan(9^\circ) < 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

4. Hence, $\theta_0 < \theta_c(k,\alpha) < 45^\circ$ for $k \geq 12$ and $\alpha^2 \leq k-2$. According to Lawlor's table, $0 < \theta_0 \leq \theta_F(k,\alpha) < 45^\circ$ for $7 \leq k \leq 11$ and $\alpha^2 \leq k-2$. Thus, when $k \geq 7$ and $\alpha^2 \leq k-2$,

$$0 < \theta_0 < 45^\circ. \tag{3.14}$$

5. For our case, M_+ is of dimension $m_1 + 2m_2$, so $k_0 = \dim(C(M_+)) = m_1 + 2m_2 + 1$. A very delightful and special property of focal submanifolds is that, for a point p of M_+ and any unit normal ν to $C(M_+)$ at p, the second fundamental form for ν with respect to certain orthonormal basis of T_xM_+ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{m_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -I_{m_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & O_{m_1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.15}$$

Hence

$$\alpha_0^2 = 2m_2 \Rightarrow \alpha_0 = \sqrt{2m_2} = \sqrt{k_0 - 1 - m_1} \leq \sqrt{k_0 - 2}. \tag{3.16}$$

Therefore, when $k_0 \geq 7$, by (3.16), (3.13) and (3.14), Lawlor's criterion applies and consequently $C(M_\pm)$ are minimizing.

6. When $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 2)$, (k, α^2) equals $(6, 4)$ for $C(M_+)$ and $(5, 2)$ for $C(M_-)$. The vanishing angle exists for the latter and $< 27^\circ$, whereas the former seems subtle because of encountering "(***)". Using the fact $\inf_\nu \det(1 - th_{ij}^\nu) = (1+t)^2(1-t)^2$ instead of the control $F(2, t, 5)$, one can figure out that vanishing angle for the former exists and is less than 25°.

Thus, our proof of Theorem 1 is complete. □

3.3. **Cases for $g = 3$ and 6.** In both cases, $m_1 = m_2 = m$. Theorem 2 says precisely the following.

Theorem 2′. For $(g, m) = (3, 2), (3, 4), (3, 8)$ or $(6, 2)$, cones over focal submanifolds are minimizing.

Proof. With respect to a unit normal vector at a point in a focal submanfold, the second fundamental form (shape operator) would be similar to (3.15). They are (cf. [CR85])

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\cdot I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\cdot I_2 \end{pmatrix},\ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\cdot I_4 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\cdot I_4 \end{pmatrix},\ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\cdot I_8 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\cdot I_8 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.17}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\cdot I_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{3}\cdot I_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\cdot I_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\cdot I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & O_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.18}$$

respectively. Hence $(k, \alpha^2) = (5, \frac{4}{3}), (9, \frac{8}{3}), (17, \frac{16}{3})$ and $(11, 12\frac{4}{3})$. According to Lawlor's table and (3.10), vanishing angle θ_0 exists and $< 30^\circ$ for each of them. Namely, the θ_0-normal wedges over the focal submanifold under consideration are nonintersecting. So the statement stands. □

Remark. By Cartan, for $g = 3, m = 1$, $M_\pm$ is isometric to $\mathbb{R}P^2$ with constant Gaussian curvature ; for $g = 6, m = 1$, $M_\pm$ is diffeomorphic to $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}P^2$ (see, for example, [Miy13]).

4. Cones over products of focal submanifolds in spheres

Given two focal submanifolds $f_1 : M_1^{k_1} \hookrightarrow S^{n_1}(1)$ and $f_2 : M_2^{k_2} \hookrightarrow S^{n_2}(1)$ for isoparametric foliations of spheres, with g_1, g_2 respectively. Define an embedding $G : M \triangleq M_1^{k_1} \times M_2^{k_2} \to S^{n_1+n_2+1}(1)$ by

$$(x, y) \mapsto (\lambda f_1(x), \mu f_2(y)), \quad \text{with } \lambda = \sqrt{\frac{k_1}{k_1+k_2}} \text{ and } \mu = \sqrt{\frac{k_2}{k_1+k_2}}.$$

We write x and y short for $f_1(x)$ and $f_2(y)$ for convenience. Together with $\eta_0 = (\mu x, -\lambda y)$, orthonormal bases $\{\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_{n_1-k_1}\}$ and $\{\tau_1, \cdots, \tau_{n_2-k_2}\}$ of $T_x^\perp M_1$ and $T_y^\perp M_2$ form an orthonormal basis $\{(\sigma_1, 0), \cdots, (\sigma_{n_1-k_1}, 0),\ (0, \tau_1), \cdots, (0, \tau_{n_2-k_2}),\ \eta_0\}$ of the normal space of $G(M)$ at $P \triangleq (\lambda x, \mu y)$ in $S^{n_1+n_2+1}(1)$.

Let A be the symbol of shape operators. Then $A_{(\sigma_i,0)},\ A_{(0,\tau_i)} : T_PM \to T_PM$, $A_{\sigma_i} : T_xM_1 \to T_xM_1$ and $A_{\tau_i} : T_yM_2 \to T_yM_2$ have the following relations:

$$A_{(\sigma_i,0)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda}A_{\sigma_i} & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$A_{(0,\tau_i)} = \begin{pmatrix} O & O \\ O & \frac{1}{\mu}A_{\tau_i} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Also note that there are three Levi-Civita connections

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} M & \hookrightarrow & S^{n_1+n_2+1} & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2+2} \\ \nabla & & \overline{\nabla} & & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

and, for tangent vector fields $X = (X_1, X_2)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2)$ around P, we have

$$\begin{aligned} < A_{\eta_0} X, Y > &= < \overline{\nabla}_X Y - \nabla_X Y, \eta_0 > = < \mathcal{D}_X Y, \eta_0 > = - < \mathcal{D}_X \eta_0, Y > \\ &= - < \mathcal{D}_{(X_1,X_2)}(\mu x - \lambda y), Y > = < (-\frac{\mu}{\lambda} X_1, \frac{\lambda}{\mu} X_2),\ (Y_1, Y_2) > . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$A_{\eta_0} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\mu}{\lambda} I_{k_1} & O \\ O & \frac{\lambda}{\mu} I_{k_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\operatorname{trace}(A_{\eta_0}) = 0$. These imply that, G minimally embeds M into $S^{n_1+n_2+1}(1)$.

4.1. **For normal radius.** At $P = (\lambda x, \mu y) \in M$, let

$$N = (a_1 \xi_1 + a_0 \mu x, a_2 \xi_2 - a_0 \lambda y), \quad a_0,\ a_1,\ a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$$

where ξ_1 is a unit normal to M_1 at x in $S^{n_1}(1)$ and ξ_2 a unit normal to M_2 at y in $S^{n_2}(1)$, such that $\omega \triangleq \|N\|$ attains the smallest (nonzero) for

$$Q = P + N \ \in \text{ the cone } C(M).$$



Let $\phi \triangleq \arctan \omega$. There are three possibilities to consider for smallest ω. If none of these three cases support a finite ω, we define $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}$. Suppose $\phi < \frac{\pi}{2}$ (the actual situation for $g_1,\ g_2 \in \{3,\ 4,\ 6\}$). Then $Q = \big(a_1 \xi_1 + (a_0 \mu + \lambda) x,\ a_2 \xi_2 + (-a_0 \lambda + \mu) y\big)$.

(I). $a_1 \cdot a_2 \neq 0$. Recall that ([CR85]) along any normal geodesic of M_1 in $S^{n_1}(1)$, it takes length $\frac{\pi}{g_1}$ to arrive at its pairing focal submanifold. So before $\frac{2\pi}{g_1}$ it cannot get back to M_1. The same holds for M_2 in $S^{n_2}(1)$. It follows that

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{a_1^2 + (a_0\mu + \lambda)^2}{\lambda^2} = \dfrac{a_2^2 + (\mu - a_0\lambda)^2}{\mu^2}; \\ \dfrac{a_0\mu + \lambda}{a_1} = \cot\phi_1, \qquad \text{where } \phi_1 \in \dfrac{2\pi}{g_1} \cdot \mathbb{Z}; \\ \dfrac{\mu - a_0\lambda}{a_2} = \cot\phi_2, \qquad \text{where } \phi_2 \in \dfrac{2\pi}{g_2} \cdot \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

Since $a_1 a_2 \neq 0$, it implies that ϕ_1, ϕ_2 cannot belong to $\pi \cdot \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{a_1^2}{\lambda^2 \sin^2\phi_1} = \frac{a_2^2}{\mu^2 \sin^2\phi_2} \triangleq t^2,$$

so that $a_1 = t\lambda \sin\phi_1$, $a_2 = \pm t\mu \sin\phi_2$. Thus,

$$\begin{cases} a_0\mu + \lambda = \quad t\lambda\cos\phi_1 \\ \mu - a_0\lambda = \pm t\mu\cos\phi_2 \end{cases}$$

which implies, by the relation $\lambda^2 + \mu^2 = 1$, that

$$\begin{cases} 1 = t(\lambda^2\cos\phi_1 \pm \mu^2\cos\phi_2), \\ a_0 = t\lambda\mu(\cos\phi_1 \mp \cos\phi_2). \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Now

$$\omega^2 = a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_0^2 = t^2[\lambda^2\sin^2\phi_1 + \mu^2\sin^2\phi_2 + \lambda^2\mu^2(\cos\phi_1 \mp \cos\phi_2)^2],$$

which, together with (4.1), implies that

$$\omega^2(\lambda^2\cos\phi_1 \pm \mu^2\cos\phi_2)^2 = [\lambda^2\sin^2\phi_1 + \mu^2\sin^2\phi_2 + \lambda^2\mu^2(\cos\phi_1 \mp \cos\phi_2)^2]. \tag{4.2}$$

By adding $(\lambda^2\cos\phi_1 \pm \mu^2\cos\phi_2)^2$ to both sides of (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\omega^2 + 1)(\lambda^2\cos\phi_1 \pm \mu^2\cos\phi_2)^2 \\ = \ & [\lambda^2\sin^2\phi_1 + \mu^2\sin^2\phi_2 + \lambda^2\cos^2\phi_1 + \mu^2\cos^2\phi_2] \\ = \ & 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Comparing (4.1) with (4.3) leads to

$$t^2 = \omega^2 + 1, \ \text{ in particular, } \ |t| = |\sec\phi| \quad \text{(geometric meaning of } t\text{)}.$$

To seek for the smallest ω, we consider the chance

$$\omega^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2|\cos\frac{2\pi}{g_1}| + \mu^2|\cos\frac{2\pi}{g_2}|}\right)^2 - 1. \tag{4.4}$$

Notice that $g_1,\ g_2 \in \{3,\ 4,\ 6\}$. By ranges of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2,

$$\omega^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \mu^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 - 1 = 3. \tag{4.5}$$

*R*emark. In fact, when $g_1 = g_2 = 4$, (4.4) produces infinity. However, in this case, the realizable (4.10) below asserts the finiteness of $\tan^2\phi$,

(II). $a_1 \neq 0,\ a_2 = 0$. (Similar for $a_1 = 0,\ a_2 \neq 0$.)
For this case, we have

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{a_1^2 + (a_0\mu + \lambda)^2}{\lambda^2} = \dfrac{(\mu - a_0\lambda)^2}{\mu^2} \\ \qquad \dfrac{a_0\mu + \lambda}{a_1} = \cot\phi_1 \qquad\qquad \text{where } \phi_1 \in \dfrac{2\pi}{g_1} \cdot \mathbb{Z} \end{cases}$$

As argued in **(I)**, ϕ_2 cannot belong to $\pi \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ and assume

$$\frac{a_1^2}{\lambda^2 \sin^2\phi_1} = \frac{(\mu - a_0\lambda)^2}{\mu^2} \triangleq t^2, \tag{4.6}$$

so that

$$\begin{cases} a_1 = \ \ t\lambda \sin\phi_1, \\ \mu - a_0\lambda = \ \pm t\mu. \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

Similarly,

$$a_0\mu + \lambda = t\lambda\cos\phi_1 \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$(\omega^2 + 1)(\lambda^2\cos\phi_1 \pm \mu^2)^2 = 1. \tag{4.9}$$

Again, for the smallest ω, we focus on the likelihood

$$\omega^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2|\cos\frac{2\pi}{g_1}| + \mu^2}\right)^2 - 1. \tag{4.10}$$

By the range of ϕ_1,

$$\omega^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \mu^2}\right)^2 - 1. \tag{4.11}$$

(III). $a_1 = a_2 = 0$.
In this case, $Q = \Big((a_0\mu + \lambda)x,\ (-a_0\lambda + \mu)y\Big) \in C(M)$ which implies

$$\frac{(a_0\mu + \lambda)^2}{\lambda^2} = \frac{(\mu - a_0\lambda)^2}{\mu^2}. \tag{4.12}$$

It is not hard to see that, only when $\lambda \neq \mu$, there is possibly a finite solution

$$a_0 = \frac{2\sqrt{k_1 k_2}}{k_1 - k_2},$$

and

$$\omega^2 = \frac{4k_1 k_2}{(k_1 - k_2)^2}. \tag{4.13}$$

Hence, for $g_1,\ g_2 \in \{3,\ 4,\ 6\}$, $\tan^2\phi$ is no less than, by definition, the smallest quantity in (4.5), (4.11) and (4.13).

4.2. **Existence of vanishing angles.** Let $\xi_1,\ \xi_2$ be unit normals to M_1 and M_2 at x and y in $S^{n_1}(1)$ and $S^{n_2}(1)$, and A_{ξ_1}, A_{ξ_2} the corresponding shape operators respectively. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1 &= (\xi_1,\ 0) \\ \eta_2 &= (0,\ \xi_2) \\ \eta_0 &= (\mu x,\ -\lambda y) \end{aligned}$$

Then, for a unit normal $\varsigma \triangleq \sum_{i=0}^{2} c_i\eta_i$ with $\sum_{i=0}^{2} c_i^2 = 1$, the shape operator A_ς of M at $(\lambda x, \mu y)$ in $S^{n_1+n_2+1}(1)$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda}\Big[-c_0\mu I_{k_1} + c_1 A_{\xi_1}\Big] & O \\ O & \frac{1}{\mu}\Big[c_0\lambda I_{k_2} + c_2 A_{\xi_2}\Big] \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since M_1 and M_2 are minimal, $\mathrm{trace}(A_{\xi_1}) = 0$ and $\mathrm{trace}(A_{\xi_2}) = 0$. Set $S \triangleq \dim(M) = k_1 + k_2$. It follows that

$$\|A_\varsigma\|^2 = c_0^2 S + c_1^2\frac{S}{k_1}\|A_{\xi_1}\|^2 + c_2^2\frac{S}{k_2}\|A_{\xi_2}\|^2. \tag{4.14}$$

We make the following observations from (3.15), (3.17) and (3.18):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } M_i \text{ corresponds to } (g,m) = (3,2),\ (3,4),\ (3,8), &\quad \text{then } \|A_{\xi_i}\|^2 = \frac{k_i}{3}; \\ \text{if } M_i \text{ corresponds to } g = 4, &\quad \text{then } \|A_{\xi_i}\|^2 \leq k_i - 1; \\ \text{if } M_i \text{ corresponds to } (g,m) = (6,2), &\quad \text{then } \|A_{\xi_i}\|^2 = \frac{40}{3} = \frac{4}{3}k_i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the expression (4.14), we always have

$$\|A_\varsigma\|^2 \leq \frac{4}{3}S. \tag{4.15}$$

For $S = 8,\ 9$ or 10 and $\alpha^2 \leq \frac{4}{3}S$, vanishing angle $\theta_F(S+1,\alpha)$ exists according to Lawlor's table and the fact that $\theta_F(9,\ \sqrt{\frac{32}{3}}) < 18^\circ$.

When $S \geq 11$, we seek for the existence of vanishing angle θ_c. Note that, when the dimension of a cone equals 12, Lawlor's table confirms the existence of θ_c for $\alpha^2 \leq 19$. Recall (3.10): for $\ell > k$

$$\tan(\theta_c(\ell, \frac{\ell}{k}\alpha)) < \frac{k}{\ell}\tan(\theta_c(k,\alpha)). \tag{4.16}$$

Since $\dfrac{x^2}{x-1}$ is strictly increasing for $x \geq 2$, one can find that, when $\ell > k \geq 2$,

$$\frac{(\frac{\ell\alpha}{k})^2}{\ell - 1} = \frac{\ell^2\alpha^2}{k^2(\ell-1)} > \frac{\alpha^2}{k-1}. \tag{4.17}$$

Take $(k, \alpha^2) = (12, 19)$ and fix $\ell > 12$. Then $\theta_c(12, \sqrt{19})$ in the latter term of (4.16) exists, and so does $\theta_c(\ell, \frac{\ell}{12}\sqrt{19})$. By monotonicity (3.11), if $\tilde{\alpha}^2 \leq (\frac{\ell\sqrt{19}}{12})^2$, $\theta_c(\ell, \tilde{\alpha})$ exists. In particular, according to (4.17), the existence of $\theta_c(\ell, \tilde{\alpha})$ for $\tilde{\alpha}^2 = \frac{4}{3}(\ell-1) < \frac{19}{11}(\ell-1) < (\frac{\ell\sqrt{19}}{12})^2$ is guaranteed. As a result, $\theta_c\left(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}S}\right)$ exists for the case of $S \geq 11$.

Hence, θ_F and θ_0 always exist for $S \geq 8$.

4.3. **Comparison between ϕ and $2\theta_0$.** If we could show that

$$(\star) \quad 2\theta_0 < \phi,$$

where the normal radius ϕ is given at the end of §4.1, then Lawlor's criterion applies.

By Appendix, we have

$$\min\left\{3, \frac{4k_1k_2}{(k_1-k_2)^2}\right\} > \min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2\cdot\frac{1}{2}+\mu^2}\right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2+\mu^2\cdot\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 - 1\right\}. \tag{4.18}$$

Assume that $k_1 \leq k_2$ from now on. One can see that

$$\left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2\cdot\frac{1}{2}+\mu^2}\right)^2 - 1 \geq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2+\mu^2\cdot\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 - 1.$$

Hence,

$$\tan^2\phi \geq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2+\mu^2\cdot\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 - 1,$$

and therefore

$$\cos\phi \leq 1 - \frac{k_1}{2S}. \tag{4.19}$$

Remark 4.1. *Note that t in §4.1 is allowed to be negative. It implies that the upper bound $1-\frac{k_1}{2S}$ is in fact uniform for $|\cos\phi_\iota|$ where ϕ_ι corresponds to any intersection point (if existed, except $\pm P$) of $G(M_1\times M_2)$ and a great circle perpendicular to $G(M_1\times M_2)$ through P.*

Now we are at a position to prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. Note that $4 \le k_1 \le k_2$ in the case. Since $\theta_F(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}S})$ exists for $S \ge 8$, we have, by (3.2), (3.4), (3.12) and (4.15), that

$$\tan\theta_0 \le \tan\theta_F(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}S}) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}S}}\sqrt{\frac{S}{S-1}} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\sqrt{\frac{1}{S-1}}.$$

Then

$$\tan 2\theta_0 < \frac{4\sqrt{3(S-1)}}{4S-7}.$$

Since

$$\tan^2\phi \ge \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{k_1}{2S}}\right)^2 - 1 \ge \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{4}{2S}}\right)^2 - 1 = \frac{4(S-1)}{(S-2)^2} > \frac{3(S-1)}{(S-\frac{7}{4})^2} > \tan^2 2\theta_0\,, \tag{4.20}$$

we have($\star$) and thus complete the proof. □

Let us assume $S \ge 11$ and figure out when ($\star$) holds. Note that

$$\tan\left[\theta_c(12, \sqrt{\frac{44}{3}})\right] < \tan 9.55^\circ < 0.1683.$$

Combined with (4.16), (4.17) and (3.11), the existence of $\theta_c\big(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}S}\big)$ supports that

$$\tan\theta_0 < \tan\left[\theta_c\big(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}S}\big)\right] < \frac{12}{S+1}\tan\left[\theta_c\big(12, \sqrt{\frac{44}{3}}\big)\right]. \tag{4.21}$$

Then

$$\tan 2\theta_0 < \frac{2\cdot\frac{12}{S+1}\cdot 0.1683}{1-\left(\frac{12}{S+1}\cdot 0.1683\right)^2}\,.$$

Hence, with the agreement that $k_1 \le k_2$, it is sufficient to show

$$\tan^2\phi \ge \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{k_1}{2S}}\right)^2 - 1 \ge \left(\frac{2\cdot\frac{12}{S+1}\cdot 0.1683}{1-\left(\frac{12}{S+1}\cdot 0.1683\right)^2}\right)^2 > \tan^2 2\theta_0\,, \tag{4.22}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\left(k_1 S - \frac{k_1^2}{4}\right)\left[(S+1)^2 - (12 * 0.1683)^2\right]^2 - \left(S - \frac{k_1}{2}\right)^2 [24(S+1) * 0.1683]^2 > 0. \tag{4.23}$$

Proof of Theorem 4. When $k_1 \geq 4$, a proof is given in that of Theorem 3. Consider now that $k_1 = 2$ and 3. To determine the sign of polynomial (4.23), we run the following codes in Mathematica:

```
F[S_, k1_] := (k1 * S - k1^2 / 4) ((S + 1)^2 - (12 * 0.1683)^2)^2 - (S - k1 / 2)^2 (24 (S + 1) * 0.1683)^2
Solve[F[S, 2] == 0, S]
Solve[F[S, 3] == 0, S]
```

```
{{S → -1.25327 - 0.975824 i}, {S → -1.25327 + 0.975824 i}, {S → 0.981136}, {S → 1.00653}, {S → 5.17643}}
```

```
{{S → -1.28445 - 1.11279 i}, {S → -1.28445 + 1.11279 i}, {S → 1.31889}, {S → 1.71919 - 1.45711 i}, {S → 1.71919 + 1.45711 i}}
```

and it can be seen that, whenever $S \geq 11$ for (4.21), we have (4.23) hold.

Let us check the cases of $S = 9,\ 10$ for $k_1 = 2$ (which can imply the cases for $k_1 = 3$). By Lawlor's table, $\theta_F(10, \sqrt{12}) < 13.51^\circ$ and $\theta_F(11, \sqrt{\frac{40}{3}}) < 11.35^\circ$. Then direct computations show that $\tan^2\phi \geq (\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{9}})^2 - 1 > \tan^2 27.02^\circ$ and $\tan^2\phi \geq (\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{10}})^2 - 1 > \tan^2 22.70^\circ$ respectively. So, $\phi > 2\theta_F$ and the proof gets complete. □

4.4. **Extension to the multiple case.** We exhibit the ideas about generalizations of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 only for products over three focal submanifolds. The case involving more components can be similarly done by induction.

Given three focal submanifolds $f_1 : M_1^{k_1} \hookrightarrow S^{n_1}(1)$, $f_2 : M_2^{k_2} \hookrightarrow S^{n_2}(1)$ and $f_3 : M_3^{k_3} \hookrightarrow S^{n_3}(1)$ for isoparametric foliations of spheres. Define $\tilde{G} : \tilde{M} \triangleq M_1^{k_1} \times M_2^{k_2} \times M_3^{k_3} \to S^{n_1+n_2+n_3+2}(1)$ by

$$(x, y, z) \mapsto (\lambda' f_1(x),\ \mu' f_2(y),\ \tau' f_3(z)), \quad \text{with}$$

$$\lambda' = \sqrt{\frac{k_1}{k_1+k_2+k_3}},\ \mu' = \sqrt{\frac{k_2}{k_1+k_2+k_3}} \text{ and } \tau' = \sqrt{\frac{k_3}{k_1+k_2+k_3}}.$$

Then $\tilde{G} : \tilde{M} \hookrightarrow S^{n_1+n_2+n_3+2}(1)$ is a minimal embedding, which follows from that

$$M_1 \times M_2 \times M_3 \cong (M_1 \times M_2) \times M_3, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{G}(x,\ y,\ z) = G(G(x,\ y),\ z)$$

where map G is given for two minimal submanifolds at the beginning of this section.

Let $\tilde{S} = k_1 + k_2 + k_3$. With the above understanding, it easily follows, from expressions (4.15) and (4.14), that the norm square of shape operator of $\tilde{M}$ at every point for any unit normal is no more than $\frac{4}{3}\tilde{S}$. Hence, vanishing angles $\tilde{\theta}_F$ and $\tilde{\theta}_0$ corresponding to that in §4.2 and those in proofs of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 exist.

Without loss of generality, assume that $k_1 \leq k_2 \leq k_3$. Let ϕ and $\tilde{\phi}$ be the normal radii of $M_1 \times M_2$ in $S^{n_1+n_2+1}(1)$ and $\tilde{M}$ in $S^{n_1+n_2+n_3+2}(1)$ respectively. We stick to the notation $S = k_1 + k_2$. Set $\tilde{\lambda} = \sqrt{\frac{S}{\tilde{S}}}, \tilde{\mu} = \sqrt{\frac{k_3}{\tilde{S}}}$ and $\tilde{K} = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{\tilde{\mu}} = \sqrt{\frac{S}{k_3}}$, . Then, applying the discussions

of **(I)**, **(II)** and **(III)** to $(M_1 \times M_2) \times M_3$, we have, according to Appendix and Remark 4.1, that

$$\tan^2\tilde{\phi} \geq \min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}^2(1-\frac{k_1}{2S})+\tilde{\mu}^2}\right)^2 - 1,\ \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}^2+\tilde{\mu}^2\cdot\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 - 1\right\}. \tag{4.24}$$

Hence, we gain an inheritable relation (with the property in Remark 4.1)

$$\cos\tilde{\phi} \leq 1 - \frac{k_1}{2\tilde{S}}. \tag{4.25}$$

Based on the proofs of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4, it then follows correspondingly that

$$\tan^2\tilde{\phi} \geq \left(\frac{1}{1-\dfrac{k_1}{2\tilde{S}}}\right)^2 - 1 > \tan^2 2\tilde{\theta}_F \geq \tan^2 2\tilde{\theta}_0. \tag{4.26}$$

The descendent (4.25) and coupled property in Remark 4.1 are crucial for this procedure to be valid for the induction on the number of focal submanifolds.

4.5. **To include** $g = 2$**.** Due to the distinct behaviors of corresponding focal submanifolds, we save the discussions about $g = 2$ separately in this subsection. Since the case of products over spheres has been classified by [Law91]. We only consider the mixed type. More explicitly, let $M_1^{k_1}, \cdots, M_r^{k_r}$ be focal submanifolds in spheres corresponding to $g \in \{3, 4, 6\}$, and $N_1^{l_1}, \cdots, N_s^{l_s}$ focal submanifolds for $g = 2$. Then $M = M_1^{k_1} \times \cdots \times M_r^{k_r} \times N_1^{l_1} \times \cdots \times N_s^{l_s}$ with $r,\ s \geq 1$ is what we are concerned about.

(A). $M = (M_1^{k_1} \times \cdots \times M_r^{k_r}) \times N_1^{l_1}$. Namely $r \geq 1$ and $s = 1$. Denote the normal radius of the minimal submanifold M in the sphere by $\hat{\phi}$. Assume that $k_1 \leq \cdots \leq k_r$ and set $K = k_1 + \cdots + k_r$. Then **(I)**, **(II)** and **(III)** give a lower bound

$$\min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\frac{K}{K+l_1}(1-\frac{k_1}{2K})+\frac{l_1}{K+l_1}}\right)^2 - 1,\ \frac{4Kl_1}{(K-l_1)^2}\right\}.$$

of $\tan^2\hat{\phi}$. Although the last term of the following has no apparent geometric meaning in the current case, one can deduce from Remark .2 that

$$\tan^2\hat{\phi} \geq \min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{k_1}{2(K+l_1)}}\right)^2 - 1,\ \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{l_1+1}{K+l_1}}\right)^2 - 1\right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\tan^2\hat{\phi} \geq \left(\frac{1}{1-\dfrac{\min\{k_1,\ 2(l_1+1)\}}{2(K+l_1)}}\right)^2 - 1. \tag{4.27}$$

(B). $M = (M_1^{k_1} \times \cdots \times M_r^{k_r}) \times (N_1^{l_1} \times \cdots \times N_s^{l_s})$ with $r \geq 1$ and $s \geq 2$. We use symbols ϕ_0 and $\hat{\phi}$ to represent the normal radii of minimal products $N_1^{l_1} \times \cdots \times N_s^{l_s}$ and M in the corresponding spheres, respectively. Assume that $l_1 \leq \cdots \leq l_s$ and set $L = l_1 + \cdots + l_s$. Then, according to §5.1 of [Law91], $\phi_0 = \cos^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{2l_1}{L}\right)$. Also note that the minimal $N_1^{l_1} \times \cdots \times N_s^{l_s}$ is symmetric about the origin. Hence, $\cos\phi_0 = 1 - \frac{2l_1}{L}$ has the uniform upper bound property mentioned in Remark 4.1. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tan^2\hat{\phi} &\geq \min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\frac{K}{K+L}(1-\frac{k_1}{2K})+\frac{L}{K+L}}\right)^2 - 1,\ \left(\frac{1}{\frac{K}{K+L}+\frac{L}{K+L}(1-\frac{2l_1}{L})}\right)^2 - 1\right\} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{1-\dfrac{\min\{k_1,\ 4l_1\}}{2(K+l_1)}}\right)^2 - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

Observe that by induction relation (4.14) can lead to the same result as (4.15) for M. Thus, by comparing (4.27) and (4.28) with (4.20), (4.22) and (4.26), we can include $g = 2$ in the generalized Theorem 4 with no restriction on l_1, under the same dimension assumption. (Results of the products of purely spheres are due to [Law91].)

As a conclusion remark, we point out that, if $M = M_1^{k_1} \times N_1^{l_1} \times \cdots \times N_s^{l_s}$ with $\dim(M) = 8$, the condition $k_1 \geq 4$ is sufficient for $C(M)$ to be minimizing in the corresponding Euclidean space.

Appendix

In §4.1 we figure out four quantity candidates to be a lower bound of $\tan^2\phi$. To make arguments in §4.3, §4.4 and §4.5 simple, a proof of the following useful inequality is given here.

Proposition 1. *For $a,\ b > 0$ and $a \neq b$, we have*

$$\frac{4ab}{(a-b)^2} > \min\left\{\left(\frac{a+b}{b}\right)^2 - 1,\ \left(\frac{a+b}{a}\right)^2 - 1\right\} = \min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{a}{a+b}}\right)^2 - 1,\ \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{b}{a+b}}\right)^2 - 1\right\}.$$

Proof. Assume $b > a > 0$. One has

$$4b^3 > 3b^3 > (b-a)^2(2b+a).$$

Hence,

$$\frac{4b}{(a-b)^2}a > \frac{2b+a}{b^2}a = \left(\frac{a+b}{b}\right)^2 - 1.$$

Similarly, for $a > b > 0$, it follows that

$$\frac{4a}{(a-b)^2}b > \frac{2a+b}{a^2}b = \left(\frac{a+b}{a}\right)^2 - 1.$$

□

Remark .2. *For integers $p, q \geq 1$ and $p \neq q$, the above inequality can be improved to*

$$\frac{4pq}{(p-q)^2} \geq \min\left\{\left(\frac{p+q}{q-1}\right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{p+q}{p-1}\right)^2 - 1\right\} = \min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{p+1}{p+q}}\right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{q+1}{p+q}}\right)^2 - 1\right\}.$$

Here we think of a nonzero number divided by zero as infinity. More precisely, when $p > q \geq 1$,

$$\frac{4pq}{(p-q)^2} \geq \left(\frac{p+q}{p-1}\right)^2 - 1 = \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{q+1}{p+q}}\right)^2 - 1,$$

with equality if and only if $q = 1$.

Acknowledgments. We thank Professor Gary Lawlor for permission of using his graph and tables from [Law91], Professor Michael Kerckhove and Doctor Chao Qian for useful comments. The second author wishes to thank Professor Leon Simon sincerely for many helpful explanations about [HS85]. This work was sponsored in part by NSFC (No. 11331002, 11526048, 11601071), the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, and the SRF for ROCS, SEM.

References

[Abr83] U. Abresch, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four or six distinct principal curvatures*, Math. Ann. **264** (1983), 283–302.

[Alm66] F.J. Almgren, Jr., *Some interior regularity theorems for minimal surfaces and an extension of Bernstein's theorem*, Ann. Math. **84** (1966), 277–292.

[BDGG69] E. Bombieri, E. De Giorgi, and E. Giusti, *Minimal cones and the Bernstein problem*, Invent. Math. **7** (1969), 243–268.

[CCJ07] T.E. Cecil, Q.S. Chi, and G.R. Jensen, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures*, Ann. Math. **166** (2007), 1–76.

[CR85] T.E. Cecil and P.J. Ryan, *Tight and taut immersions of manifolds*, Research Notes in Math. 107, Pitman, London, 1985.

[Chi] Q.S. Chi, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures IV*, arXiv:1605.00976.

[DG65] E. De Giorgi, *Una estensione del teorema di Bernstein*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **19** (1965), 79–85.

[DN85] J. Dorfmeister and E. Neher, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces, case g=6, m=1*, Comm. Algebra **13** (1985), 2299–2368.

[Fed69] H. Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1969.

[FK85] D. Ferus and H. Karcher, *Non-rotaional minimal spheres and minimizing cones*, Comment. Math. Helv. **60** (1985), 247–269.

[FKM81] D. Ferus, H. Karcher, and H.F. Münzner, *Cliffordalgebren und neue isoparametrische Hyperflächen*, Math. Z. **177** (1981), 479–502.

[Fle62] W.H. Fleming, *On the oriented Plateau problem*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo **11** (1962), 69–90.

[HS85] R. Hardt and L. Simon, *Area minimizing hypersurfaces with isolated singularities*, J. Reine. Angew. Math. **362** (1985), 102–129.

[HKT00] D. Hirohashi, T. Kanno, and H. Tasaki, *Area-minimizing of the cone over symmetric R-space*, Tsukuba J. Math. **24** (2000), 171–188.

[Kan02] T. Kanno, *Area-minimizing cones over the canonical embedding of symmetric R-spaces*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **51** (2002), 89–125.

[Ker94] M. Kerckhove, *Isolated orbits of the adjoint action and area-minimizing cones*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **121** (1994), 497–503.

[Law91] G.R. Lawlor, *A Sufficient Criterion for a Cone to be Area-Minimizing,* Vol. 91, Mem. of the Amer. Math. Soc., 1991.

[Law72] H.B. Lawson, Jr., *The equivariant Plateau problem and interior regularity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **173** (1972), 231-249.

[Miy13] R. Miyaoka, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with (g, m) = (6, 2)*, Ann. Math. **177** (2013), 55–110.

[Miy16] ———, *Errata of "Isoparametric hypersurfaces with (g, m) = (6, 2)"*, Ann. Math. **183** (2016), 1057–1071.

[Mün80] H.F. Münzner, *Isoparametric hyperflächen in sphären, I and II,* Math. Ann. **251, 256** (1980, 1981), 57-71, 215-232.

[OS] S. Ohno and T. Sakai, *Area-minimizing cones over minimal embeddings of R-spaces,* arXiv:1507.02006.

[Sim74] P. Simoes, *On a class of minimal cones in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1974), 488–489.

[Sim73] ———, *A class of minimal cones in* $\mathbb{R}^n$*,* $n \geq 8$*, that minimize area*, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.

[Sim83] L. Simon, *Lectures on Geometric Measure Theory*, Vol. 3, Proc. Centre Math. Anal. Austral. Nat. Univ., 1983.

[Sim68] J. Simons, *Minimal varieties in riemannian manifolds*, Ann. Math. **88** (1968), 62–105.

[Wan94] Q.M. Wang, *On a class of minimal hypersurfaces in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Math. Ann. **298** (1994), 207–251.

[TY13] Z.Z. Tang and W.J. Yan, *Isoparametric foliation and Yau conjecture on the first eigenvalue*, J. Differential Geom. **94** (2013), 521–540.

[XYZ] X.W. Xu, L. Yang, and Y.S. Zhang, *New area-minimizing Lawson-Osserman cones,* arXiv:1610.08208.

[Zha16] Y.S. Zhang, *On Lawson's area-minimizing hypercones*, Acta Math. Sinica-English Ser. **32** (2016), 1465-1476.

[Zie62] W.P. Ziemer, *Integral currents mod* 2, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **105** (1962), 496-524.

Chern Institute of Mathematics & LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P. R. China
E-mail address: zztang@mx.cei.gov.cn

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, Jilin, P. R. China
E-mail address: yongsheng.chang@gmail.com